

Docket No. 5195



PATENT

#19  
3/13/01  
JH

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED  
MAR-9 2001  
TC 2600 MAILROOM

Applicant(s): SALKINI et al.

Examiner: C. Lee

Serial No.: 09/245,292

Art Unit: 2663

Filed: February 5, 1999

FOR: **MULTI-PROTOCOL WIRELESS COMMUNICATION APPARATUS AND METHOD**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application. A petition for a one-month extension of time is filed herewith. Claims 1-104 are pending.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the Applicants' representative, John Harrop, during a March 5, 2001 personal interview. The substance of that interview is incorporated in the remarks that follow.

The Office Action objects to the drawings. Upon allowance of the application, Applicants will submit formal drawings.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 6, 18, 19, 20, 27-35, 38, 46-48, 52, 66-68, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,592,480 to Carney et al. (hereafter Carney). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed to during the personal interview, independent claims 1, 27, 46, and 47 define over Carney. Accordingly, claims 1, 27, 46, and 47 are allowable.

Claims 6, 18, 19, and 20 depend from claim 1; claims 28-35 and 38 depend from claim 27; and claims 48, 52, 66-68, and 70 depend from claim 47. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 6, 18, 19, 20, 28-35, 38, 48, 52, 66-68, and 70 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6, 18, 19, 20, 27-35, 38, 46-48, 52, 66-68, and 70 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 2-5, 7, 49-52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carney. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claims 1 and 47 are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1; and claims 49-52 and 53 depend from claim 47. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 2-5, 7, 49-52 and 53 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-5, 7, 49-52 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 8-12, 21, 23-25, 36, 37, 41-45, 54, 55, 57, 69, 71, and 74-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carney in view of U.S. Patent 5,289,179 to Beeson et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claims 1, 27, and 47 are allowable. Claims 8-12, 21, and 23-25 depend from claim 1; claims 36, 37, and 41-45 depend from claim 27; and claims 54, 55, 57, 69, 71, and 74-80 depend from claim 47. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 8-12, 21, 23-25, 36, 37, 41-45, 54, 55, 57, 69, 71, and 74-80 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-12, 21, 23-25, 36, 37, 41-45, 54, 55, 57, 69, 71, and 74-80 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 13-16, 22, 56, and 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carney in view of U.S. Patent 5,752,186 to Malackowski et al. (hereafter Malackowski). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claims 1 and 47 are allowable. Claims 13-16 and 22 depend from claim 1; and claims 56 and 58-62 depend from claim 47. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 13-16, 22, 56, and 58-62 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-16, 22, 56, and 58-62 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claims 17 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carney in view of U.S. Patent 5,729,536 to Doshi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claims 1 and 47 are allowable. Claim 17 depends from claim 1 and claims 63-65 depend from claim 47. Accordingly, claims 17 and 63-65 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 63-65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claims 26, 39, 40, 73, and 81-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carney in view of U.S. Patent 5,572,579 to Orriss et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claims 1, 27, and 47 are allowable. Claim 26 depends from claim 1; claims 39 and 40 depend from claim 27; and claims 73 and 81-85 depend from claim 47. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 26, 39, 40, 73, and 81-85 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26, 39, 40, 73, and 81-85 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carney in view of U.S. Patent 5,276,906 to Felix. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claim 47 is allowable. Claim 72 depends from claim 47, and for this reason, and the additional features it recites, claim 72 is also allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 72 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, claims 86-88, 90-92, and 94-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,581,596 to Hogan et al. (hereafter Hogan) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,414,806 to Richards et al. (hereafter Richards). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed to during the personal interview, independent claim 86 defines over Hogan and Richards, individually and in combination. Accordingly, claim 86 is allowable.

Claims 87, 88, 90-92, and 94-104 depend from claim 86, and for this reason and the additional features they recite, claims 87, 88, 90-92, and 94-104 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 86-88, 90-92, 94-104 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, claims 89 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hogan in view of Richards, and further in view of Carney. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claim 86 is allowable. Claims 89 and 93 depend from claim 86, and for this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 89 and 93 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 89 and 93 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

For these reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and that all claims are allowable. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees created by this amendment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 04-1425.

Respectfully submitted,



John Harrop  
Reg. No. 41,817  
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Suite 300 South  
Washington, DC 20004  
Voice: 202-824-8821  
Fax: 202-824-8890

Date: March 7, 2001